

### **REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 16, 2004 ("Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-26 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-26. Applicants amend Claims 2, 7-10, 13-16, 19-22, and 24-26 to advance the prosecution of this case. Applicants cancel Claims 1, 5, 11, 17, and 23. Applicants add new Claims 27-29. Favorable action is requested.

### **Consideration of Information Disclosure Statements**

Applicants note with appreciation Examiner's consideration of the art cited in the IDS dated April 22, 2002.

### **Amended Claims**

Claims 2-4, 5-10, 12-16, 18-22, and 24-29 are allowable over the proposed combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,787,245 issued to You et al. ("*You*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,128,679 issued to Beale et al. ("*Beale*") for the reasons provided below.

New Claim 27 has been amended to present one embodiment of the invention in a different context. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is allowable over both *You* and *Beale*. For example, neither *You* nor *Beale* teaches or suggests "a router operable to receive the thread control message from the first PTE and to route the received thread control message to both a second PTE and a third PTE comprising a diagnostic tool," as recited by Claim 27. Favorable action is requested.

Claim 9 is allowable over the proposed combination at least because neither *You* nor *Beale* teaches or suggests "transmitting a copy of the intercepted thread control message to a diagnostic tool of a third PTE," as recited by Claim 9. For example, column 2, lines 22-25 of *Beale* teaches a network interface circuit 21b that communicates control signals 37 with IOP Get thread 21A-3 and "cause[s] the data to be received" by IOP Get thread 21A-3 from the network 1. However, *Beale* does not describe the network interface circuit 21b as a device operable to transmit a copy of the intercepted thread control message to a second PTE and to a diagnostic tool. In fact, it appears that *Beale* does not even contemplate the use of a diagnostic tool. Thus Claim 9 is allowable over *You* and *Beale*. Favorable action is requested.

For reasons analogous to those provided in conjunction with Claim 9, Claims 15 and 21 are also allowable. Favorable action is requested.

As depending from their respectively allowable independent Claims 27, 9, 15, and 21, dependent Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-26, 28, and 29 are allowable. Favorable action is requested.

**CONCLUSION**


Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending Claims.

Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If the Examiner feels that a conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, Douglas M. Kubehl stands willing to conduct such a telephone interview at the convenience of the Examiner. Mr. Kubehl may be reached at 214-953-6486.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Douglas M. Kubehl  
Reg. No. 41,915

Date: May 12, 2004

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201  
Phone: (214) 953-6486

Customer No. **05073**